

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 28, 2008. Claims 19, 22, 23, 26 and 28 to 33 are pending in the application, of which Claims 19, 26, 28 and 31 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 28 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 28 to clarify that the display names are displayed in a display so as to identify the retained resources. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the method of Claim 28 generates a useful, concrete and tangible result, namely the display having the retained resources identified by the set of display names. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 19, 23, 26, 28 and 30 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,506 (Ukai). Claims 22, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over AAPA and Ukai in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,099,869 (Forstall). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 19 is directed to a data processing apparatus, which communicates with an image processing apparatus that processes image data by using resources retained in memory. The apparatus includes retention means for retaining resources which are utilized in image processing; and setting means for setting display names of a resource or information indicating that a display name is not displayed for each of the resources retained by the retention means. The display names or the information

indicating that a display name is not displayed is set for each of the resources and for each print language used in the image processing apparatus by the setting means.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely AAPA and Ukai, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the apparatus of Claim 19. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of setting display names of a resource or information indicating that a display name is not displayed for each of the resources retained by a retention means, wherein the display names or the information indicating that a display name is not displayed is set for each of the resources and for each print language used in the image processing apparatus.

In the Office Action, it is alleged that AAPA discloses retaining resources and using display names set for the retained resources. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's interpretation of AAPA. Referring to page 6, lines 2-17, of the present application, it is stated that "(f)urther, besides the method of retaining one resource under separate names, there are also cases where processing is executed in order to display one resource by a name on a per-print-language basis. This is processing for displaying the name of a resource contained in an apparatus upon converting the resource name based upon information held beforehand by each program dedicated to a print language. In this case, the conversion processing cannot be executed in relation to a resource for which information does not previously exist on the side of the print-language dedicated program, as in the manner of a resource created and downloaded to the apparatus by a user, and therefore a method of displaying such a resource under a separate name for each and every print language does not exist." That is, according to AAPA, a certain name is given to each resource in advance. In turn, a programs dedicated to a

respective print language converts the given name into an alias name corresponding to the respective print language and then displays the converted name.

In contrast to the process disclosed in AAPA, the present invention sets display names of a resource or information indicating that a display name is not displayed for each of the resources. Therefore, different names can be given to a resource in advance, whereby a name conversion process is not required for displaying the names corresponding to different print languages.

Furthermore, nowhere is it disclosed or suggested by AAPA that information indicating that a display name is not displayed for each resource is used as featured in the present invention. By virtue of this feature, an apparatus in accordance with Claim 19 displays a name in a case where a name has been set for a particular resource, or does not display a name in a case where information indicating that a display name is not displayed, for each of the resources. By virtue of this feature, a user can select an appropriate resource with reference to displayed names corresponding to respective resources while not being burdened with trying to resolve the identity of an unnamed resource.

Furthermore, while Ukai may allegedly disclose setting display names of resources as stated in the Office Action, Ukai fails to disclose or suggest setting a resource name or information indicating that a display name is not displayed for each of the resources. As indicated above, by virtue of this feature, an apparatus in accordance with the present invention can set information indicating that a display name is not displayed for each of the resources.

In light of the deficiencies of AAPA and Ukai as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 19 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 26 is directed to a data processing apparatus using specified retention and setting units, substantially in accordance with the apparatus, retention and setting means of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 26 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 28 is directed to a data processing method substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 28 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 31 is directed to a computer-readable medium storing a computer program substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 31 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS\_WS 2799224v1